

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 PAUL SZOLLOSI, Derivatively on Behalf of  
11 Nominal Defendant JUNO THERAPEUTICS,  
12 INC.,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 HANS E. BISHOP, *et al.*,

16 Defendants.

CASE NO. C17-1665 RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE


17 This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. On November 6, 2017, Plaintiff Paul  
18 Szollosi filed a Cover Sheet listing as a related case *Mays v. Bishop, et al.*, Case No. 17-cv-  
19 1356-RSM, which in turn lists *In re Juno Therapeutics, Inc.*, Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM, as a  
20 related case. *See* Dkt. #1-1; Case No. 17-cv-1356-RSM Dkt. #1-1. The Court has examined  
21 the Complaint in this case and in Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM, and believes there is cause to  
22 consolidate these matters under Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM.

23 In response to this Order, Plaintiff must write a short and plain statement telling the  
24 Court: (1) why this case should not be consolidated with Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM; (2) if this

1 case should not be consolidated, how it can proceed parallel to Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM; (3)  
2 why Plaintiff is not a member of the class in Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM and therefore subject  
3 to the restrictions discussed in Case No. 16-cv-1069-RSM, Dkt. #40. **This Response may not**  
4 **exceed six (6) double-spaced pages.** The Court will take no further action in this case until  
5 this Response is submitted.

6 Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file a Response to  
7 this Order to Show Cause containing the detail above **no later than fourteen (14) days from**  
8 **the date of this Order.**

9  
10 DATED this 20 day of November, 2017.

11  
12 

13 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
14 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24